

University of Groningen

## The "others" in a lex sacra from the Attic deme Phrearrhioi (SEG 35.113)

Wijma, Sara

*Published in:*  
Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*  
2013

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Wijma, S. (2013). The "others" in a lex sacra from the Attic deme Phrearrhioi (SEG 35.113). *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 187, 199-205.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

SARA M. WIJMA

THE “OTHERS” IN A *LEX SACRA* FROM THE ATTIC DEME PHREARRHIOI  
(*SEG* 35.113)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 187 (2013) 199–205

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THE “OTHERS” IN A *LEX SACRA* FROM THE ATTIC DEME PHREARRHIOI (*SEG* 35.113)\*

In 1970, Eugene Vanderpool published a fragmentary inscription (*SEG* 35.113) containing a decree that seems to have been issued by the members of the Attic deme Phrearrhioi.<sup>1</sup> Previous scholarship has mainly focussed on the issuing body, the nature of the rites and deities mentioned in the decree and possible associations with known polis festivals, and the nature of the Eleusinion named thrice (9; 18; 23).<sup>2</sup> Here, I want to focus on the group of participants who are mysteriously referred to as τῶν ἄλλων in the decree (8). David Whitehead interpreted these “others” as local metics, living in the deme, comparable to τὸς μετοίκ[ος] who are recorded as the recipients of a share of a sacrifice to Leos in a *lex sacra* of the Skambonidai (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 244. C4–10).<sup>3</sup> Robert Simms has convincingly refuted this interpretation, emphasising the (unique?) vagueness of “the others” in the Phrearrhian decree compared to the explicitness of the Skambonidai decree. Observing that no Greek inscription appears to fail to further specify groups designated as οἱ ἄλλοι, and that the καί immediately following τῶν ἄλλων precludes any such further identification in the Phrearrhian decree, Simms concluded that the others in our decree are just that, an unidentified and unidentifiable crowd to be associated with the international clientele of the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>4</sup>

In what follows, the reference to τῶν ἄλλων in the decree from Phrearrhioi will be placed in several, increasingly larger contexts – from the text of the inscription, to (Eleusinian) cults and sanctuaries in Attic demes that appear to mimic those of the polis, and, finally, to an epigraphic trend in several larger demes that seems to point to increasing supra regional claims of some of the larger demes across Attica at the close of the fourth century. In that way, I hope to shed a new light on the identification not only of “the others” mentioned in the decree but also of the decree itself and the Eleusinion mentioned in it. In addition, I hope to somewhat further our understanding of the complex dynamics of deme religion, especially concerning demes asserting their own (cultic) identity in relation and as related to larger polis cults and sanctuaries.

Phrearrhioi was a coastal deme of the φυλή Leontis. It was a relatively large deme: every year the demesmen could send no less than nine representatives to the βουλή.<sup>5</sup> From this deme, located by Vanderpool in southern Attica on account of the find spot near the modern village Kalyvia Olympou<sup>6</sup>, comes *SEG* 35.113, which on the basis of the letterforms and the transitional endings of the imperatives can be roughly dated to

---

\* I would like to thank Stephen Lambert and the participants of the Fransum colloquium on “Sacred landscapes – connecting routes” (9–4-2011, Fransum, the Netherlands) for their useful comments on earlier versions of this paper. All remaining errors and misinterpretations are of course my own.

<sup>1</sup> E. Vanderpool, A *lex sacra* of the Attic Deme Phrearrhioi, *Hesp.* 39 (1970) 47–53.

<sup>2</sup> Recently: R. Simms, The Phrearrhian *lex sacra*. An Interpretation, *Hesp.* 67 (1998) 91–107; E. Lupu, A Note on *SEG* XXXV 113, in: D. Jordan and J. Traill (eds.), *Lettered Attica. A Day of Attic Epigraphy. Proceedings of the Athens Symposium, 8 March 2000* (Toronto 2003) 69–77 (= E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents* (Leiden 2005) no. 3; cf. *SEG* 55.256). In what follows I refer to Lupu’s edition.

<sup>3</sup> D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica, 508/7 – ca. 250 BC. A Political and Social Study* (Princeton 1986) 205. On the participation of immigrants *qua* metics in the rites of the polis and the demes as an important context for the articulation of Athenian μετοικία: S. M. Wijma, *Embracing the Immigrant. The Participation of Metics in Athenian Polis Religion (5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)* (*Historia Einzelschriften*), forthcoming. Contrary to what one might expect from such a large deme, not much is known about this community and its residents. For instance, only one metic is attested as living in Phrearrhioi: on a fourth-century curse tablet (*IG* III App. 81) we come across Pataikon, who is recorded as ‘living in Phrearrhioi’.

<sup>4</sup> Simms (1998) 99.

<sup>5</sup> J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica. A Study of the Demes, Trittyes, and Phylai, and their Representation in the Athenian Council* (*Hesp. Suppl.* 14) (Princeton 1975) 5–6, 18–19.

<sup>6</sup> Vanderpool (1970) 50–53. Cf. M. Salliora-Oikonomakou, Duo archaia ergasteria sten perioche tou Thorikou, *ADelt* 51–52.A (1996–1997 [2000]) 137–140, who on the basis of the mine leased by a Epikrates in Phrearrhioi (*SEG* 16.123.36–37) argues for a location northeast of the χαράδρα of Kamariza, which holds many traces of ancient habitation.

ca. 300 BC.<sup>7</sup> The decree appears to deal with the participation of the Phrearrhioi in several rites of Demeter and her Eleusinian companions: Demeter Thesmophoros (2), Demeter (Phrearrhios?<sup>8</sup>) (12), Kore (12–13), Plouton (7; 19), and Iakchos (26) are all named. Next to references to sacrifices (7; 12), a meat distribution (6), *hierosyna* (5; 19), and several officials like priestesses (11; 20), a herald (6) and ἱεροποιοί (1; 5–6; 10), we come across a torch holder (4) and an altar and a courtyard in an Eleusinion (9; 18; 23), corroborating the notion that the decree is dealing with specifically Eleusinian rites and deities.

In lines 7–8 it is stated that “[the demesmen] together with the others [---]” are to receive or share in something, possibly the sacrifice [of a ram] to Plouton mentioned in line 7:

[...ΙΙ]λούτωνι θυόντωνσαν κρ(ιὸ)[ν -----τοῖς]  
[δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶν [-----]<sup>9</sup>

As the preamble is missing we do not know for certain on whose authority the decree was issued and, therefore, in which context we should understand the reference to “the others”. Because of the probable reference to the δημόται ([τοῖς] | [δημ]όταις – 8) and the certain reference to the Phrearrhioi (Φρεαρ(ρ)ρίων – 12) Vanderpool assumed it was a deme decree dealing with deme ἱερά in a local Eleusinion.<sup>10</sup> In reaction to Robin Osborne’s suggestion that it might as well be a decree issued by a local Eleusinion and not a deme decree at all, Simms has furthermore pointed out that the decree seems to represent many characteristics of a typical public sacred calendar and, more convincingly, that civic officials like ἱεροποιοί and heralds are normally not exclusively associated with a single sanctuary but rather with a deme or with the polis at large.<sup>11</sup> We should thus understand “the others” as “the others in relation to the δημόται”.

Now what kind of ἱερά were these “others” to share in together with the Phrearrhian δημόται? Evidently, the rites have an Eleusinian character. In addition, it has been noted that they included both eschatological and agricultural overtones, melting, so to say, the Mysteries and the Thesmophoria.<sup>12</sup> Any further identification of the rites recorded mainly depends on the identification of the Eleusinion mentioned in the text. This Eleusinion, with its courtyard and altar of Plouton, is usually thought to refer to the one in Athens.<sup>13</sup> Simms, in addition, points out that the preoccupation with minute detail of procedure in the decree suggests that the rites were unfamiliar to the Phrearrhioi and their sacred personnel and therefore probably took place outside the deme.<sup>14</sup> Most scholars correspondingly argue that the decree deals with the participation of the Phrearrhioi in the Eleusinian Mysteries, which they see confirmed by the mention of Iakchos in line 26, who is closely connected with the procession from Athens to Eleusis during the Mysteries and who is not attested outside Athens-Eleusis.<sup>15</sup> In this case, “the others” could indeed refer to the unidenti-

<sup>7</sup> Simms (1998) 93.

<sup>8</sup> The epithet Phrearrhios for Demeter was restored by Simms (1998) 92. The epithet is found on an inscribed seat in the theatre of Dionysos for the priestess Δήμητρ[ος] Φρεαρρό[υ] (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5155, dated to the imperial age).

<sup>9</sup> As the right margin of this stoichedon inscription is missing and not one line can be restored completely with certainty, it is impossible to establish the number of letters missing on the right.

<sup>10</sup> Vanderpool (1970) 50.

<sup>11</sup> Simms (1998) 93, in reaction to R. Osborne, *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985) 177 with n. 39 (p. 251), who stated that Vanderpool’s comment (1970) 50, that the mention of the Phrearrhioi points to a deme decree is a *non sequitur*. On ἱεροποιοί in demes: Whitehead (1986) 142–143. Including those mentioned in the Phrearrhian decree, ἱεροποιοί are attested in six demes.

<sup>12</sup> Simms (1998) 94–95.

<sup>13</sup> On the Athenian Eleusinion: M. M. Miles, *The City Eleusinion (The Athenian Agora 31)* (New Jersey 1998).

<sup>14</sup> Simms (1998) 99–100.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. N. D. Robertson, New Light on Demeter’s Mysteries: the Festival Proerosia, *GRBS* 37 (1996) 351 n. 93; Simms (1998) 101–106; R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford 2005) 333. In line 27 there is a reference to ἐβδόμη ---], which Simms (1998) 103–106, connects with 16 and 17 Boedromion, on which days, according to Simms, took place the ritual called ἱερεῖα δεῦρο and the Epidauria. Cf. N. D. Robertson, The Sequence of Days at the Thesmophoria and the Eleusinian Mysteries, *EMC/Mouseion* 43 (1999) 17 n. 61 and 26 n. 87, who tenuously connects the Phrearrhian decree with 5 and 7 Pyanopsion, on which were held the proclamation of the Proerosia and the Pyanopsia.

able international crowd gathering at Eleusis to participate in the Mysteries together with the Phrearrhioi, as Simms suggested.<sup>16</sup>

However, when the site of a shrine or sacrifice is not further specified in this kind of “calendars”, this usually means local sites were concerned.<sup>17</sup> Since the Eleusinion in the Phrearrhian decree does not seem to be further specified, for instance as the one “ἐν ἄστει”<sup>18</sup>, it is more likely that the decree lays down regulations concerning a local, i.e. Phrearrhian Eleusinion. Robert Parker has furthermore noted that the decree specifies priestly perquisites, which implies the issuing body must have had some control over the rites and the shrine.<sup>19</sup> An important argument, moreover, *against* the suggestion that the decree stipulates the participation of the Phrearrhioi in the Mysteries is the fact that deme participation is very much at odds with the individual focus of the Mysteries; participation in and initiation into the rites of Demeter and Kore was not entered upon with or mediated through one’s deme or polis community as it was an affair of the individual initiate. In fact, not only do the deme calendars we have never refer to participation in the Mysteries by a deme *qua* deme, local cult is moreover very much in abeyance during the time of the Mysteries, i.e. mid Boedromion, possibly to create the circumstances for the individual δημότης or δημότις to visit the Mysteries.<sup>20</sup> It is therefore far more likely that the Phrearrhian decree sets out to regulate the participation of the Phrearrhioi and “the others” in Eleusinian rites at a local Eleusinion.

Local Eleusinia are attested all over Attica. Besides the one in Phrearrhioi and the famous one in Athens, they are attested in Paiania<sup>21</sup>, the Marathonian Tetrapolis<sup>22</sup>, Phaleron<sup>23</sup>, Thorikos<sup>24</sup>, and possibly Brauron.<sup>25</sup> Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood made the interesting observation that, with the exception of the ones in Athens and Phaleron, which were part of the ritual nexus of the Eleusinian Mysteries, these local Eleusinia were all located in the south and southeast of Attica, at a relative distance from the Athens-Eleusis(-Phaleron) axis that was so important to the rituals of the Mysteries. As an explanation of this “spread” she suggested that these Eleusinia answered to a need in these relatively far away demes to secure

<sup>16</sup> Supra footnote 4.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. S. D. Lambert, *The Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: a Revised Text*, *ZPE* 130 (2000) 52, on the Eleusinion in the Marathonian calendar (*SEG* 50.168.17).

<sup>18</sup> In the Erchian calendar the location of a sacrifice to Demeter is specified as taking place ‘in the Eleusinion in the city’ (*SEG* 21.541 II.4–5).

<sup>19</sup> Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 332–333. Parker is, however, generally hesitant to see the Eleusinia mentioned in the decrees from Phrearrhioi, Paiania (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250.15–16; 17–18; 26–27) and Marathon (*SEG* 50.168.17) as local shrines as they would be remarkably faithful replicas of the ones in Eleusis or Athens, which is, I argue, sort of the point. On these local Eleusinia see further below.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 187 n. 63. The calendar of Teithras (*SEG* 21.542) is empty in mid Boedromion, while the one from the Marathonian Tetrapolis explicitly dates a rite ‘in Boedromion before the Mysteries’ (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1358 II.5). The calendar from Thorikos records a sacrifice to Demeter in Boedromion (*SEG* 33.147.21–22) but the exact date is unclear.

<sup>21</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250.15–16; 17–18; 26–27 (450–430). Both S. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of Gods. Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion* (Oxford 2004) 154 and Parker, *Polytheism* (2009) 332–333, try to make a case *against* this Eleusinion being a local one, as one sacrifice seems to be specified as taking place “here” (20), with the sacrifices in the Eleusinion to be understood as taking place “there”. However, similar to the arguments for a local Eleusinion at Phrearrhioi, it can be argued that as the Paianian decree seems to record penalties to be paid to the deme (2–5), obligations of the priestess (5–6), the quorum of δημόται needed to change regulations (11–14), priestly perquisites (33–35), and orders ἱεροποιοί to act as marshals and appoint assistants (9–11), it seems this Eleusinion was under local control as well.

<sup>22</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1358 = *SEG* 50.168.17 (400–350). On this Eleusinion: supra footnote 17.

<sup>23</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 32.26–28; 34 (449–447).

<sup>24</sup> Although an Eleusinion is not mentioned in the sacrificial calendar from Thorikos (*SEG* 33.147 (380–375)), there is strong circumstantial evidence for a local Eleusinion in this deme: 1) *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2600 (boundary stone for a τέμενος ‘τοῖν θεοῖν’); 2) J. S. Boersma, *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.* (Groningen 1970) 78–80, for the Doric building at Thorikos of Periclean date that could be an Eleusinion; 3) many Eleusinian rites are mentioned in *SEG* 33.147.21–22, 38–39; 4) several typically Eleusinian cultic vessels have been found in the mining area near and in Thorikos: J. Ellis Jones, Another Eleusinian *kernos* from Laureion, *BSA* 77 (1982) 191–199; C. Mitsopoulou, The Eleusinian Processional Cult Vessel, in: M. Haysom and J. Wallensten (eds.), *Current Approaches to Religion in Ancient Greece. Papers Presented at a Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 17–19 April 2008* (Stockholm 2011) 190, with footnotes 2, 5–6.

<sup>25</sup> I. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* (Berlin 1814–1821) 1, 242.

the protection of the Eleusinian deities, and especially of Demeter.<sup>26</sup> Even earlier, Robin Osborne had similarly argued that the local Eleusinia throughout Attica expressed a continued link with the cult of Demeter in Eleusis, creating opportunities to worship Eleusinian deities to those who were unable to (regularly) attend the festivals in Eleusis.<sup>27</sup>

The way from Phrearrhioi to Eleusis via Athens is *ca.* 70 km long and would take a person wishing to participate in the rites of Eleusis at least fifteen hours.<sup>28</sup> Although the ancient Greeks were much more accustomed to long travels than we are – the Mysteries were in fact visited by people from all over the Greek world – and although actual initiation into the Mysteries only occurred at Eleusis, this lengthy trip was perhaps still felt as an impediment to the Phrearrhioi to regularly attend the (other) rites in Eleusis. The distance from the ritually potent Athens-Eleusis nexus could, in addition, be thought to stand in the way of a good relationship between the Phrearrhioi and the Eleusinian deities. A local Eleusinion would offer a perfect solution to these obstacles to both human participation and divine protection.

Osborne has furthermore suggested that the foundation of such a local cult modelled on the Eleusinian *exemplum* also offered a deme a means to assert its identity as worshipping community both on its own and as dependent on what happened in Athens-Eleusis, i.e. as being alternatives by also being confirmations.<sup>29</sup> In addition, I would like to argue that the establishment of an Eleusinion and the mimicking on a local level of typically Eleusinian ritual language, particularly that of the Mysteries, could perhaps also be seen as a sign or claim of supra regionalism, as a deme asserting its identity both as a local community and as a constituent part of the polis, but also as a cultic centre with aspirations in the wider region.

The phenomenon of demes or, more generally speaking, local Attic communities recreating larger polis cults and festivals at their own, local level is widely attested, especially in the so-called deme calendars.<sup>30</sup> Jon Mikalson first observed that many of these local observances concern polis festivals that pertained to the household and/or were celebrated (exclusively) by women, like the Skira, celebrated locally, for instance, in Piraeus, the Thesmophoria, celebrated in many demes, and the Theogamia, celebrated on 27 Gamelion in Athens, on which day the Erchians sacrificed to Zeus Teleios, Poseidon, Kourotrophos and Hera.<sup>31</sup> To this list Parker has added the Anthesteria and the Pyanopsia, both mentioned in the calendar from Thorikos, which he sees as locally celebrated polis festivals, due to the character of the rites and the focus on the household.<sup>32</sup> Still, demes also celebrated polis cults and festivals that cannot be explained away in this way. In these cases the local communities of Attica appear to assert their identity almost as a

<sup>26</sup> C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reconstructing Change: Ideology and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, in: M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing Ancient Culture. Historicism, Periodization and the Ancient World* (London 1997) 148–149. These Eleusinia are only attested in relatively large demes, which can be compared to the spread of theatres and deme celebrations of the rural Dionysia as observed by N. F. Jones, *Rural Athens under the Democracy* (Philadelphia 2004) 128–141, with smaller and/or neighbouring demes participating in and being protected by the worship of Dionysos/Demeter in the larger demes. The mention of a sacrifice by the Erchians ‘in the Eleusinion in the city’ on 12 Metageitnion, i.e. the eve of the Eleusinia (*SEG* 21.541 II.2–6) seems to corroborate this idea.

<sup>27</sup> Osborne, *Demos* (1985) 176–177.

<sup>28</sup> Estimated with the help of Google maps.

<sup>29</sup> Osborne, *Demos* (1985) 178. Cf. C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *What is Polis Religion?*, in: R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford 2000) 28–32, for the ways in which deme religion tied in with polis religion.

<sup>30</sup> On the sacrificial calendars and on deme religion in general: S. Dow, *Six Athenian Sacrificial Calendars*, *BCH* 92 (1968) 170–186; J. D. Mikalson, *Religion in the Attic Demes*, *AJP* 98 (1977) 424–435; Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 177–222, with 185–208 on the calendars; V. Rosivach, *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens* (Atlanta 1994) 14–36; Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 130–196; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 50–78, with 65–78 on the calendars. Doubts have been raised as to whether these calendars are really the calendars of demes or rather of pre-Kleisthenic communities that still existed in the classical period, like the Tetrapolis: M. H. Jameson, *Religion and Athenian Democracy*, in: I. Morris and K. Raafaub (eds.), *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges* (Dubuque 1998) 193; S. D. Lambert, *Parerga III: the Genesis*, *Basile and Epops* again, *ZPE* 139 (2002) 81 n. 21.

<sup>31</sup> Mikalson (1977) 429–431.

<sup>32</sup> Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 75–77.

polis on its own.<sup>33</sup> The Erchians, for instance, seem to celebrate their own version of the Arrhephoria in their deme, with sacrifices to Kourotrophos, Athena Polias, Aglauros, Zeus Polieus, Poseidon, and Pandrosos.<sup>34</sup> The Erchians even seem to replicate the basic spatial taxonomy of the ἄστυ: we come across references to an Erchian (Akro)Polis, an Agora and a Pagos. Other grand polis festival and polis cults were also observed on local, deme level. The Thorikioi celebrated their own Plynteria, with a sacrifice to Athena and Aglauros.<sup>35</sup> The calendars of Marathon and Erchia appear to flirt with the City Dionysia, celebrated in Athens just before the middle of Elaphebolion: on 10 Elaphebolion the Marathonians sacrificed a goat (to Ge?) and on 16 Elaphebolion the Erchians sacrificed to Dionysos and Semele.<sup>36</sup> Michael Jameson associated the sacrifice of a ram to Menedeios in Erchia on 19 Thargelion with the Bendideia celebrated on the same day<sup>37</sup>, while the Erchians perhaps also celebrated their own Genesia, as Stephen Lambert has suggested.<sup>38</sup>

Interestingly, Eleusinian festivals, cults and deities play a prominent role in this phenomenon of polis festivals and cults being celebrated and recreated on a local level.<sup>39</sup> We already came across the four and possibly five Eleusinia in south(east) Attica.<sup>40</sup> Also, the calendars from both the Marathonian Tetrapolis and Paiania are remarkable in their prominence of Eleusinian festivals.<sup>41</sup> The Eleusinian epithets “Thesmophoros” and “Eleusinia” for Demeter are widely attested and distributed across and even beyond Attica.<sup>42</sup> Typical Eleusinian cult vessels, so-called κέρνοι or πλημοχόαι, are occasionally found outside Eleusis and Athens, perhaps, as Christina Mitsopoulou suggests, to maintain (or (re)create?) a material link with the rites in Eleusis.<sup>43</sup> This Eleusinian prominence in the local communities of Attica could, obviously in addition to procuring the much needed protection from Eleusinian deities, perhaps be explained by the role the Mysteries and Eleusinian deities played in the promotion of Eleusis/Athens as a cultic centre to be reckoned with within the larger Greek world.<sup>44</sup>

In that sense, the mimicking of Eleusinian rites, and specifically the Mysteries, in Phrearrhioi – i.e. the founding of a local Eleusinion with an altar of Plouton and a courtyard, which would have no function outside Eleusis<sup>45</sup>, and the occurrence of Iakchos – could be interpreted as advertising the supra regional

<sup>33</sup> See of course the famous remark in Thucydides (2.16.2) that when the Athenians decided to evacuate the Attic countryside, ‘Deep was their trouble and discontent at abandoning their houses and the hereditary temples of the ancient constitution, and at having to change their habits of life and to bid farewell to what each regarded as his native city’ (ἐβαρύνοντο δὲ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔφερον οἰκίας τε καταλείποντες καὶ ἱερὰ ἃ διὰ παντὸς ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας πάτρια δίαίταν τε μέλλοντες μεταβάλλειν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος – transl. J. M. Dent and E. P. Dutton, *Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War* (London and New York 1910)), nicely illustrating the importance of shared cult for a deme community’s sense of self and the polis-like nature of the demes.

<sup>34</sup> M. Jameson, Notes on the Sacrificial Calendar of Erchia, *BCH* 89 (1965) 156–157.

<sup>35</sup> *SEG* 33.147.53–54 (sacrifice to Athena and Aglauros), with N. Robertson, The Riddle of the Arrhephoria at Athens, *HSCP* 87 (1983) 280–284, who also, but more tenuously, suggests the Erchians held their own Plynteria.

<sup>36</sup> J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton 1975) 123–129, suggested 10–14 Elaphebolion for the City Dionysia. The issue is, however, not straightforward: cf. S. D. Lambert, Polis and Theatre in Lykourgan Athens: the Honoric Decrees, in: A. P. Matthaiou and I. Polinskaya (eds.), *Mikros Hieromnemon. Meletes eis mnemen Michael H. Jameson* (Athens 2008) 53–54 n. 2. Marathonian “Dionysian” sacrifice: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1358 II.17 (= *SEG* 50.168.A2.17 = restoration of Lambert (2000) 46, 60). Erchian “Dionysian” sacrifice: *SEG* 21.541. I.45–49, IV.34–37.

<sup>37</sup> Jameson (1965) 158–159.

<sup>38</sup> Lambert (2002).

<sup>39</sup> On Eleusinian cults in the demes, still: M. P. Nilsson, Die eleusinischen Kulte der attischen Deme und das Sakralgesetz aus Paiania, *Eranos* 42 (1944) 70–76 (= *Opuscula Selecta* III (Lund 1960) 92–98).

<sup>40</sup> Parker, *Polytheism* (2009) 333.

<sup>41</sup> Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 154, notes that if the doubtful restoration of the Hephaisteia in line 6–7 is ignored, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250 seems concerned only with the cult of Eleusinian deities, making it very similar to our Phrearrhian decree.

<sup>42</sup> A. B. Stallsmith, The Name of Demeter Thesmophoros, *GRBS* 48 (2008) 115–131.

<sup>43</sup> Mitsopoulou (2011).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. K. Clinton, The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in Democratic Athens, in: W. D. E. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* (Oxford 1994) 161–172.

<sup>45</sup> Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 333.



aspirations of the Phrearrhioi. Even the vague reference to “the others” in the Phrearrhian decree could be explained thus as a sign of supra regional claims. For instead of the designation “τῶν ἄλλων” referring to the international crowd at Eleusis, as Simms suggested, it is much more likely that in imitation of the Eleusinian Mysteries the Phrearrhioi set in place a very inclusive policy concerning some of their own Eleusinian rites. Similar to the Eleusinian Mysteries, in which, according to the famous statement in Herodotus (8.65.4), ‘any Athenian who wishes and any other Greek may be initiated’<sup>46</sup>, the Phrearrhioi fashioned their Eleusinian rites as highly inclusive events in which not only the δημόται but all others who wished could participate. In that way the Phrearrhioi could assert their identity as a supra-regional community, comparable to the significance of the Mysteries for the Athenian polis in attracting and bringing together people from all over the Greek world. The Eleusinian currency was, so to say, very potent in asserting a group’s identity and dominance as going beyond the geo-political and social boundaries of the group.

Although the occurrence of “the others” in the Phrearrhian decree can thus be explained, it unfortunately remains to be guessed why the Phrearrhioi decided on this Eleusinian policy so relatively late. Most sacrificial calendars date to the first half of the fourth century, while from *ca.* 300 BC onwards we chiefly have inscriptions from demes that were characterised by quick political turnovers and a considerable and often military presence of non-Athenians and Athenians from other demes in their communities, like Piraeus, Eleusis, and Rhamnous. At first sight, the decree from Phrearrhioi seems to present us with a notable exception to this epigraphic pattern. The Phrearrhian decree does, however, have one important aspect in common with several of the decrees from these “garrison demes”, for many of these seem to acknowledge and deal with increasing pressures on the geo-political and social boundaries of the deme and its hereditary members in the late fourth century. In Rhamnous, for instance, we find over fifty tombstones emphatically recording the demotics of dead Rhamnousian δημόται, perhaps encouraged by the growing numbers of strangers living in their community.<sup>47</sup> In Piraeus, undeniably the most cosmopolitan deme, we find the δημόται honouring a certain Kallidamas from the deme Cholleidai for being a good man towards the δῆμος of the Athenians and the δῆμος of the Piraeans in *ca.* 280 BC, for which he is honoured with a foliage crown, προεδρία in the theatre, exemption from the so-called ἐγκτητικόν tax, and a share of the ἱερά of the Piraeans (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1214). Kallidamas, however, is not to share in all Piraean ἱερά, for it is stated that ‘Kallidamas is to dine with the Piraeans in all communal ἱερά except in those where the Piraeans themselves customarily enter and no one else’<sup>48</sup> (14–17), by which the Piraeans could simultaneously consolidate Kallidamas’ position in the deme, while protecting and advertising the boundaries of group.<sup>49</sup> In similar decrees we find the Rhamnousians and Eleusinians coping with large groups of outsiders present in their deme by honouring “foreign” benefactors and garrison leaders and including “other residents” as honouring parties in decrees issued by the deme, who are designated, for instance, as ‘οἱ οἰ[κ]οῦντες Ἐλε[υσίνι Ἀθηναίων]’ (*SEG* 22.127.22, mid 3<sup>rd</sup> c., Eleusis), ‘[τ]ῶν οἰκούντων ἐν Ῥαμνοῦντι’ or ‘τοῖς οἰκοῦσι τῶν πολιτῶν Ῥα[μνοῦντι]’ (*SEG* 38.127.4,5, *ca.* 220, Rhamnous), or as ‘Ἀθηναίων οἱ οἰκοῦντες’ (*SEG* 25.155.10–11, 236/5, Rhamnous).<sup>50</sup> It is in this period that the Phrearrhioi decided to

<sup>46</sup> Καὶ αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν Ἀθηναίων) τε ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων μυεῖται.

<sup>47</sup> R. Osborne, *The Potential Mobility of Human Populations*, now reprinted and updated in: idem, *Athens and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge 2010) 153–155, with n. 30 for the impressive corpus of tombstones of Rhamnousians. These fifty stones from Rhamnous constitute the majority of tombstones explicitly naming Rhamnousians across Attica by far (82%).

<sup>48</sup> συνεστιᾶσθαι Καλλιδάμαντα μετὰ Πειραιέων ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἱεροῖς πλὴν ἢ εἴ που αὐτοῖς Πειραιεῦσιν νόμιμον ἐστὶν εἰσιέναι, ἄλλωι δὲ μή.

<sup>49</sup> This was hinted at by Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 151 n. 10.

<sup>50</sup> On these and specifically the Rhamnousian decrees: R. Osborne, *The Demos and its Subdivisions in Classical Athens*, now reprinted and updated in: idem, *Athens and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge 2010) 49–61. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 360–363, sees this epigraphic trend as a sign of the breakdown of demes as real communities. Cf. N. F. Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens. The Response to Democracy* (New York and Oxford 1999) 70–81, who sees the involvement of different groups in these “deme” decrees as signs of the victory of the territorial deme over the constitutional one. For a similar notion of the breakdown of phratries as real communities as reflected in the sharp fall in the epigraphic record concerned with phratries around 250 see S. D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ann Arbor 1998) 273–275.

stipulate that “the others” could participate in their Eleusinian *ἱερόα* in their local Eleusinion, thus acknowledging the changing realities in the Attic demes and advertising its supra regional ambitions by promoting its Eleusinian rites in imitation of the Athenian promotion of the Mysteries as a claim to fame in the wider Greek world.

Sara M. Wijma, University of Groningen, History dept., P.O. box 72, 9700AB Groningen, The Netherlands  
Sara.Wijma@rug.nl